

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,318	02/19/2004	Melbourne F. Giberson	TRI 8300D3	7631
1688 7	590 03/09/2005		EXAMINER	
POLSTER, LIEDER, WOODRUFF & LUCCHESI 12412 POWERSCOURT DRIVE SUITE 200 ST. LOUIS, MO 63131-3615			LESLIE, MICHAEL S	
			· ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3745	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		St		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/782,318	GIBERSON ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Michael Leslie	3745		
The MAILING DATE of this communicatio Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicati. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, mayon. , a reply within the statutory minimum of period will apply and will expire SIX (6) No statute, cause the application to become	y a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice un	ider <i>Ex par</i> te Quayle, 1935 (C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims				
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the applic 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wit 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-3,6 and 7 is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) 4,5 and 8-11 is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction is	thdrawn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Exact 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 February 2004 Applicant may not request that any objection (Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the county of the oath or declaration is objected to by the county of the	is/are: a) accepted or b) to the drawing(s) be held in abecorrection is required if the draw	yance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). ring(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International E * See the attached detailed Office action for	iments have been received. iments have been received i e priority documents have be Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n Application No een received in this National Stage		
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-943) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/94) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/5/04.	Paper	ew Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)		

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the impeller casing" in Lines1-2 and 2 (2 occurrences). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The axial holes are only claimed to be through the runner in parent claim 1 (Line 3), thus "said axial holes through the impeller casing" lacks antecedent basis in the claims.

The term "relatively small" in claim 7 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "relatively small" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. The amount of circuit oil passed to the trough is rendered indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Elderton (4671061).

Elderton discloses a fluid coupling having an impeller (6) with an impeller casing and a runner (12) having axial holes (54, 55) through the runner for venting the impeller and runner cavities. Further including a cavity (21) in the backside of the impeller and passageways (22) from the cavity to the impeller cavity.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elderton.

Elderton discloses a fluid coupling as described above with respect to claim 1, but does not teach a material for the fabrication of the impeller, impeller casing, and runner. Applicant discloses, in paragraph 16 of the specification, that it is known from Turbo Research, Inc. to fabricate the impeller, impeller casing, and runner from steel. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Elderton by fabricating the impeller, impeller casing, and runner from steel for the purpose of increasing durability.

Art Unit: 3745

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,769,248. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,769,248 "anticipates" application claim 1. Accordingly, application claim 1 is not patentably distinct from patent claim 1.

Here, Patent claim 1 requires:

1. In a fluid coupling connected to a flywheel of a diesel engine, said fluid coupling having an impeller and impeller casing connected to an input shaft and a runner connected to an output shaft, said impeller and runner having facing cavities, flexible diaphragm plates fastened near an outer periphery of said plates to said flywheel and near a radially inner edge of said plates to an outer end of said input shaft of said fluid coupling, whereby said input shaft is supported at said outer end by said flexible diaphragm and a crankshaft bearing of said diesel

Art Unit: 3745

engine, the improvement comprising axial holes through said runner near the inside diameter

of said runner for venting the impeller and runner cavities. (Emphasis added)

While Application claim 1 requires:

1. In a fluid coupling having an impeller with an impeller casing and a runner, said

impeller and runner having facing cavities, said impeller being driven by a diesel engine, the

improvement comprising axial holes through said runner near the inside diameter of said

runner for venting the impeller and runner cavities. (Emphasis added)

Thus, it is apparent that the more specific Patent claim 1 encompasses Application claim

1. Following the rationale in In re Goodman cited in the preceding paragraph, where Applicant

has once been granted a patent containing a claim for the specific or narrower invention,

Applicant may not then obtain a second patent with a claim for the generic or broader invention

without first submitting an appropriate terminal disclaimer. Note that since application claim 1

is anticipated by Patent claim 1 and since anticipation is the epitome of obviousness, then

Application claim 1 is obvious over Patent claim 1.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4, 5 and 8-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base

claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Page 6

Claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patents 5251441 and 4581892 disclose fluid couplings having axial holes in the runner.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Leslie whose telephone number is (571) 272-4819. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Look can be reached on (571) 272-4820. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/782,318

Art Unit: 3745

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ML

March 3, 2005

Patent Examiner

AU 3745

EDWARD K. LOOK

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

14/05